

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 15, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are now all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, and 7 have been amended for grammatical purposes. No new matter has been added.

**I. Preliminary Matter**

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the drawings filed February 28, 2002, by marking acceptance of the drawings in the next Office Action.

**II. Abstract**

The Examiner has objected to the abstract. Applicant has amended the abstract as indicated above. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

**III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,023 B1; hereinafter “Matsuzawa”).

Claim 1 recites “at least one input for receiving a signal comprising a first field which is directly analysable...” The Examiner asserts that the cut-through identifier disclosed in Fig. 1E discloses the claimed first field. However, the cut-through identifier disclosed in Fig. 1E

includes a combination of the destination MAC address or source MAC address according to the address format 111 and the datalink flow identifier 134. See col. 5, lines 23-29. However, the combination of the destination MAC address or source MAC address according to the address format 111 and the datalink flow identifier 134, corresponds to the first, second and third field, respectively, of the MAC frame format disclosed in Fig. 1E. Consequently, the cut-through identifier of Fig. 1E does not disclose the claimed first field.

Claim 1 further recites “a second field which is analysable after a processing.” The Examiner cites the ordinary MAC address disclosed in Figs. 1C and 1D for teaching the claimed second field. However, it appears that the MAC address disclosed in Figs. 1C and 1D corresponds to the cut-through identifier of Fig. 1E.

Claim 1 further recites “wherein said first analyser is coupled to said processor for, in dependence of an analysis result of said first information, selecting at least one output and switching at least a part of said signal to said selected output or performing said processing, with **said first information comprising non-address information**, and with said second information comprising address information defining further network-units.” As discussed above, the first information cited by the Examiner corresponds to a combination of the destination MAC address or source MAC address according to the address format 111 and the datalink flow identifier 134 which, contrary to the claimed invention, includes address information. Moreover, it appears that all of the first fields disclosed in Matsuzawa include address information.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 5 and 7 recite similar elements, claims 5 and 7 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

**IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzawa in view of Mauger et al. (EP 1001577 A1; hereinafter “Mauger”). Claims 3 and 9 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1 and 7 for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Mauger does not cure the deficiencies of Matsuzawa.

**V. New Claims**

Applicant has added claims 11-13 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claims 11-13 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No.: 10/084,217

Attorney Docket No.: Q68604

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2006